

Reply to Office Action dated June 17, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-6, 17-20, 23, and 30-32 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the Abstract and claims 1, 4, 17, 23, and 30 are amended, and claims 2-3, 7-16, 21-22, and 24-29 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 7-16 and 24-29 have been canceled to be pursued in a Continuation application. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 3-4 and 22-23 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the features of allowable claim 3, as well as intervening claim 2, and the dependency of claim 4 has been corrected. Accordingly, independent claim 1 should be in condition for allowance along with claims 4-6, which depend therefrom. Independent claim 17 has been amended to include the features of allowable claim 22, as well as intervening claim 21, and the dependency of claim 23 has been corrected. Accordingly, independent claim 17 should be in condition for allowance along with claims 18-20 and 23, which depend therefrom.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 5-21, and 24-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Topper, U.S. Patent No. 5,268,895, in view of Brendes et al. (hereinafter "Brendes"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0049730. Claims 1, 4-6, 17-20, and 23 should be in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above. Claims 7-16 and 24-29 are canceled

to be pursued in a Continuation application, and therefore the rejection is moot with respect to these claims. The rejection is respectfully traversed in so far as it applies to claims 30-32.

The Office Action asserts that Topper discloses all of the claimed features of independent claim 30 except that "Topper never specifically discloses that the remote signaling points, that his apparatus maintains congestion status on, are 'heterogeneous.'" The Examiner then concludes that "[t]o have provided Brendes [] teaching of 2 heterogeneous networks in Topper's apparatus would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art, because both references are concerned with routing of messages around congested end points."

Independent claim 30 has been amended to recite multiple heterogeneous No. 7 signaling networks. Topper does not disclose or suggest all of the claimed features of independent claim 30, or the respective combination. That is, Topper does not disclose or suggest a method of cross-routing a signaling message between signaling points in heterogeneous No. 7 signaling networks, comprising receiving a MTP-transfer primitive from a first signaling point in a first signaling network indicating that a signaling message needs to be transferred from the first signaling point to a destination signaling point in a second signaling network, determining whether the destination signaling point exists, determining whether the destination signaling point is accessible if the destination signaling point exists, and cross-routing the signaling message from the first signaling point to the destination signaling point if the destination signaling point is accessible.

Rather, Topper discloses a single integrated signaling network in Figure 1 (referred to by the Examiner in his rejection). Figure 1 of Topper discloses local switches 1-1 and 1-2 for

Reply to Office Action dated June 17, 2005

serving user terminals U_i and a transit switch 1-3. Topper further discloses that local signaling controllers 2-1 and 2-2 and a transit signaling controller 3 are associated with the switches 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3, respectively, to constitute signal end points 4-1, 4-2, and 4-3. The signaling controllers 2-1 and 2-2 are interconnected by full-duplex signaling data links via signal transfer points 5-1 and 5-2 to form a signaling network. Figure 2 of Topper discloses details of the local signaling controllers 2-1 and 2-2. The signal end points 4-1, 4-2, and 4-3 of Topper, as well as the message transport controller 18, referred to by the Examiner in his rejection, are all part of a single integrated signaling network. Thus, Topper does not disclose or suggest a method of cross-routing a signaling message between signaling points in heterogeneous No. 7 signaling networks, comprising receiving a MTP-transfer primitive from a first signaling point in a first signaling network indicating that a signaling message needs to be transferred from the first signaling point to a destination signaling point in a second signaling network, determining whether the destination signaling point exists, determining whether the destination signaling point is accessible if the destination signaling point exists, and cross-routing the signaling message from the first signaling point to the destination signaling point if the destination signaling point is accessible.

Further, Brendes fails to overcome the deficiencies of Topper. That is, Brendes discloses in Figure 1, referred to by the Examiner in his rejection, a converged communication network 100 composed of a SS7 network (104, 106, and 108), and an IP network (112, 114, 116). Thus, Brendes also fails to disclose or suggest all of the claimed features of independent claim 30, or the respective combination.

Serial No. **09/879,201**
Reply to Office Action dated June 17, 2005

Docket No. **P-0201**

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 30 over the combination of Topper and Brendes should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 31-32 are allowable over the combination of Topper and Brendes at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 30, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carol L. Druzbeck
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 CLD/kah

Date: November 17, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610